



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,054	07/27/2001	Cary Lee Bates	RSW920010145US1	6259
26502	7590	12/03/2003	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION IPLAW IQ0A/40-3 1701 NORTH STREET ENDICOTT, NY 13760			CORRIELUS, JEAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2172	
			DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,054

Applicant(s)

BATES ET AL.

Examiner

Jean M Corrielus

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed on July 27, 2001, in which claims 1-18 are pending for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on July 27, 2001 (paper no.2) complies with the provisions of M.E.P.. § 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Drawings

3. Applicants are required to furnish the formal drawings in response this office action. No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing. Failure to timely submit a drawing will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.

Art Unit: 2172

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 are Iizuka et al (hereinafter "Iizuka") US Patent no. 6,424,980 in view of Bogonikolos et al., (hereinafter "Bogonikolos") article entitled "An Intelligent agent for adaptive personalized navigation within a Web server".

As to claim 1, Iizuka discloses the claimed "storing, in a memory a set of URLs found by a search engine in a search" as storing a list of URLs returned as a result of a search query (col.1, lines 54-57); "accessing a first web page identified by a first URL included in the set of URLs found by the search engine" as accessing the returned list of URL based on a search query (col.1, lines 58-62); "finding, in the first web page, a link to a second web page identified by a second URL" (see fig.9A-9C). Iizuka, however, does not explicitly disclose the use of "determining whether the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory"; and "marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory".

Bogonikolos, on the other hand, discloses an analogous system that shows that every page is a collection of links, wherein a first link constitutes the root of the page and by following it anyone can reach the actual corresponding URL of the web server (page 3, col.1, lines 30-36). Bogonikolos also, states that the link to home page leads to the home page of the web server, while by following link

Art Unit: 2172

3 are led to a new page with the node 3 as root and links to subtrees with nodes 31 and 32 as root. Bogonikolos states that one's can get access to page 3 by following the root link provides (page 3, col.1, line 44-col.2, line 6). These implications disclose the claimed "determining whether the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory"; and "marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory".

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of the cited references, wherein the integrated retrieval technique, provided therein (see Iizuka' fig.3) would incorporate the use of marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bogonikolos. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to utilize such a combination for the purpose of providing users with access only to the information that has significant possibility to be interesting, thereby exploiting their time more effectively and increasing their productivity.

As to claim 5, Iizuka discloses the claimed "receiving a set of URLs found by a search engine in a search" (col.1, lines 40-64); "storing a subset of the set of URL in a memory" as storing a list of URLs returned as a result of a search query (col.1, lines 54-57); "accessing a first web page identified by a first URL included in the set of URLs found by the search engine" as accessing the returned list of URL based on a search query (col.1, lines 58-62); "finding, in the first web page, a link to a second web page identified by a second URL" (see fig.9A-9C). Iizuka, however, does not explicitly disclose

Art Unit: 2172

the use of “determining whether the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”; and “marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”. Bogonikolos, on the other hand, discloses an analogous system that shows that every page is a collection of links, wherein a first link constitutes the root of the page and by following it anyone can reach the actual corresponding URL of the web server (page 3, col.1, lines 30-36). Bogonikolos also, states that the link to home page leads to the home page of the web server, while by following link 3 are led to a new page with the node 3 as root and links to subtrees with nodes 31 and 32 as root. Bogonikolos states that one’s can get access to page 3 by following the root link provides (page 3, col.1, line 44-col.2, line 6). These implications disclose the claimed “determining whether the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”; and “marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of the cited references, wherein the integrated retrieval technique, provided therein (see Iizuka’ fig.3) would incorporate the use of marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bogonikolos. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to utilize such a combination for the purpose of providing users with access only to the information that has significant possibility to be interesting, thereby exploiting their time more effectively and increasing their productivity.

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 10, Iizuka discloses the claimed “accessing a first web page” (col.1, lines 58-62); and finding, in the first web page, a link to a second web page”(see fig.9A-9C). Iizuka, however, does not explicitly disclose the use of “determining whether the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”; and “marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”.

Bogonikolos, on the other hand, discloses an analogous system that shows that every page is a collection of links, wherein a first link constitutes the root of the page and by following it anyone can reach the actual corresponding URL of the web server (page 3, col.1, lines 30-36). Bogonikolos also, states that the link to home page leads to the home page of the web server, while by following link 3 are led to a new page with the node 3 as root and links to subtrees with nodes 31 and 32 as root. Bogonikolos states that one's can get access to page 3 by following the root link provides (page 3, col.1, line 44-col.2, line 6). These implications disclose the claimed “determining whether the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”; and “marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of the cited references, wherein the integrated retrieval technique, provided therein (see Iizuka' fig.3) would incorporate the use of marking the link when the second URL is included in the set of URL stored in the memory, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bogonikolos. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to utilize such a combination for the purpose of providing users with access

Art Unit: 2172

only to the information that has significant possibility to be interesting, thereby exploiting their time more effectively and increasing their productivity.

As to claim 2, Iizuka discloses the claimed “highlighting a presentation of the link on a visual display” (col.5, lines 36-40; col.6, lines 1-12).

As to claim 3, Iizuka discloses the claimed “changing a color of a presentation of the link by a visual display” (col.2, lines 52-56).

As to claim 4, Iizuka discloses the claimed “changing a font of a presentation of the link by a visual display” (col.2, lines 52-56).

As to claim 6, Iizuka discloses the claimed “wherein the subset is a proper subset” (col.1, lines 40-65).

As to claim 7, Iizuka discloses the claimed “highlighting a presentation of the link on a visual display”(col.5, lines 36-40; col.6, lines 1-12).

As to claim 8, Iizuka discloses the claimed “changing a color of a presentation of the link by a visual display”(col.2, lines 52-56).

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 9, Iizuka discloses the claimed “changing a font of a presentation of the link by a visual display”(col.2, lines 52-56).

As to claim 12, Iizuka discloses the claimed “sending a URL that identifies the second web page from a browser to the search engine” (col.1, lines 40-65).

As to claim 11, Iizuka discloses the claimed “accepting search criteria entered by a searcher into a browser and sending the search criteria from the browser to the search engine” (col.1, lines 40-65).

As to claim 13-18

Claims 13-18 are programmable media containing programmable software performed by the method of claims 1-12. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or early communication from the Examiner should be directed to **Jean M. Corrielus** whose telephone number is (703) 306-3035. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00am to 5:30pm. If attempts to reach the Examiner

Art Unit: 2172

by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. at (703)305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: (703)305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT") Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Jean M. Corrielus

Primary Examiner

December 1, 2003